

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY



3 1761 06094458 4

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:
COPYRIGHT, TRADE-MARKS, PATENTS (298HS)**

2004/2005

VOLUME 3: PATENTS

**Abraham Drassinower
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto**

**These materials are solely for the classroom use of students in the Faculty of Law,
University of Toronto**

BORA LASKIN LAW LIBRARY

SEP 17 2004

FACULTY OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:
COPYRIGHT, TRADE-MARKS, PATENTS (298HS)**

2004/2005

VOLUME 3: PATENTS

**Abraham Drassinower
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto**

**These materials are solely for the classroom use of students in the Faculty of Law,
University of Toronto**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/intellectualprop03dras_3

Volume 3

Patents

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Gordon F. Henderson, "An Introduction to Patent Law," in Gordon F. Henderson, ed., <i>Patent law of Canada</i> (Scarborough: Carswell, 1994), at 1-14.....	1
--	---

II. Presumption of Validity

<i>Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp.</i> (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....	9
---	---

III. Novelty

<i>Xerox of Canada Ltd. et al. v. IBM Canada Ltd.</i> (1977), 33 C.P.R. (2d) 24 (F.C.A.).....	12
<i>Reeves Brothers Inc. v. Toronto Quilting & Embroidery Ltd.</i> (1978), 43 C.P.R. (2d) 145 (F.C.T.D.).....	21
<i>Beloit Canada Ltd. v. Valmet Oy</i> (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 289 (F.C.A.).....	25
<i>J.M. Voith GmbH v. Beloit Corp.</i> (1991), 36 C.P.R. (3d) 322 (F.C.A.).....	32
<i>Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp.</i> (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....	44

IV. Obviousness/Inventive Step

<i>Farbwerke Hoescht v. Halocarbon</i> (1979), 42 C.P.R. (2d) 145 (S.C.C.).....	51
<i>Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	61
<i>Beloit Canada Ltd. et al. v. Valmet Oy</i> (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 289 (F.C.A.).....	62
<i>Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp.</i> (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....	65
<i>General Tire v. Firestone</i> , [1972] R.P.C. 457 (C.A.).....	73
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. et al. v. Kimberley-Clark of Canada Ltd.</i> (1991), 40 C.P.R. (3d) 1 (F.C.T.D.).....	96
<i>Windsurfing International Inc. v. Tabur Marine (Great Britain) Ltd.</i> , [1985] R.P.C. 59 (C.A.).....	98
<i>Windsurfing International Inc. et al. v. Trilantic (now Bic Sports Inc.)</i> (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 241 (F.C.A.).....	109
<i>Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. v. Imperial Tobacco Ltd.</i> , [1993] F.C.J. No. 135 (F.C.A.).....	114

V. Utility

<i>X v. Commissioner of Patents</i> (1981), 59 C.P.R. (2d) 7 (F.C.A.).....	134
<i>Minerals Separation North American Corp. v. Noranda Mines Ltd.</i> (1952), 15 C.P.R. 133 (J.C.P.C.).....	137
<i>Burton Parsons Chemicals, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard (Canada) Ltd.</i> , [1976] 1 S.C.R. 555 (S.C.C.).....	142
<i>TRW Inc. v. Walbar of Canada Inc.</i> , [1991] F.C.J. No. 1075 (F.C.A.).....	149

VI. Subject Matter

<i>Pioneer Hi-Bred Ltd. v. Commissioner of Patents</i> (1987), 14 C.P.R. (3d) 491 (F.C.A.).....	151
<i>Pioneer Hi-Bred Ltd. v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents)</i> (1989), 25 C.P.R. 3d 257 (S.C.C.).....	155
<i>President and Fellows of Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents)</i> , [2000] F.C.J. No. 1213 (F.C.A.).....	167
<i>Schlumberger Canada Ltd. v. Commissioner of Patents</i> (1982), 56 C.P.R. (2d) 204 (F.C.A.).....	208
<i>Tennessee Eastman Co. et al. v. Commissioner of Patents</i> (1973), 8 C.P.R. (2d) 202 (S.C.C.).....	210

VII. Sufficiency of the Patent Specification

<i>Consolboard Inc. v. MacMillan Bloedel (Saskatchewan) Ltd.</i> , [1981] 1 S.C.R. 504 (S.C.C.).....	218
<i>Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	229

VIII. Infringement

<i>McPhar Engineering Co. v. Sharpe Instruments</i> (1960), 35 C.P.R. 105 (Ex. Ct.).....	241
<i>Catnic Components Ltd. v. Hill and Smith Ltd.</i> , [1982] R.P.C. 183 (H.L.).....	262
<i>Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	268
<i>O'Hara Manufacturing Ltd. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> (1989), 26 C.P.R. (3d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	272
<i>Mobil Oil Corp. et al. v. Hercules Canada Inc.</i> (1995), 63 C.P.R. (3d) 473 (F.C.A.).....	278
<i>Windsurfing International Inc. et al. v. Trilantic (now Bic Sports Inc.)</i> (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 241 (F.C.A.).....	282
<i>Camco Inc. and General Electric Company v. Whirlpool Corporation and Inglis Ltd.</i> , [2000] 2 S.C.R. 1067, (S.C.C.).....	288